

Comment on *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847 and *Lyristes* Horváth, 1926 (Insecta, Hemiptera, Homoptera): proposed conservation by the suppression of *Tibicen* Berthold, 1827 [?Latreille, 1825], and concerning the type species of *Cicada* Linnaeus, 1758 (Case 239; see BZN 41: 163–184; 71: 103–131)

K.G. Andrew Hamilton

ECORC, Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, 960 Carling Ave., Ottawa, ON, Canada (e-mail: hamiltona@agr.gc.ca)

Recent comments (BZN 71: 103–131) reviewing a dormant case, Z.N.(S.) 239 from 1984 by Melville & Sims (BZN 41: 163–184) represent repeated efforts by a few European workers to upset the long-since stabilized taxonomy of the Holarctic CICADIDAE by questioning the identity of the type-genus of an important family-level taxon, the TIBICENINI. This case had some slight merit in those days, as being needed to differentiate between the two main subfamilies of CICADIDAE: (1) TIBICENINAE, based on *Tibicen* Latreille, 1825 (or 1829) and (2) TIBICININAE, based on *Tibicina* Amyot, 1847. However, this is no longer the case as a phylogenetic classification (Moulds, 2005), widely acclaimed, suppressed TIBICENINAE within CICADINAE.

Furthermore, detailed analysis of the original use of *Tibicen* by Sanborn (BZN 71: 108–118) shows that the name was first validated by Latreille in 1825 with type-species *C.[icada] plebeia* [Scopoli, 1763]. The only point that was not clarified was the cryptic way in which the generic name was first indicated: ‘Les g. Cigale, *Tibicen* (*c. plebeia*)’ (see Fig. 1 in Sanborn op. cit.) This might be interpreted as following the same format as the tribal characterization ‘Première tribu / Chanteuses. *Stridulantes*’ in which the same name is repeated, using French vernacular (‘Chanteuses’) followed by the Latin equivalent (‘*Stridulantes*’). Using this logic, the French word ‘Cigale’ for ‘cicada’ could have been Latinized as ‘*Tibicen*’ even though these names are not exact equivalents and even though only the scientific name *C. plebeia* was italicized. However, the phrase begins with the words ‘Les g.’ which is clearly to be interpreted as ‘les genres’ and therefore indicates that *two* genera are being mentioned, *Cicada* and *Tibicen*. An exactly similar but clearer example is given by Sanborn in his fig. 4, wherein ‘Le g. Tettigone (*gypone, coelidie, iassus, ulope, tettigone, eupelix*, Germ.)’ can only be interpreted as ‘The [singular] genus *Tettigonia* [= CICADELLIDAE] ([which] Germar [has divided into] *Gypona, Coelidia, Iassus, Ulopa, Tettigonia* [and] *Eupelix*).’ Such details might be overlooked by someone who is not familiar with French, but the same cannot be said of the European workers who propose upsetting the identity of *Tibicen* in favour of *Lyristes*. One concludes that their application to the ICZN for suppression of this name at a time when it is not necessary, and which furthermore would upset a large number of well-established names in North America, is without any practical merit.

There is however one additional point that needs clarification. In his masterly treatment of the phylogeny of CICADOIDEA, Moulds rejected the family-group name TIBICININAE in favour of the junior name TETTIGADINAE, but without justifying this action by appeal to the ICZN for official approval. Although this action is unjustified it still has sufficient merit for serious consideration. The only way to suppress such a family-group name is through official rejection of the name on which it is based, *Tibicina*. This is a small Palaearctic genus of ten species, only one of which is

common, belonging to a subfamily in which the genera are distinctive based on both wing venation and male genitalia, with the exception of a very few autapomorphs. *Tibicina* has the same wing venation and male genitalia as the large Nearctic genus *Okanagana* Distant, 1908 and is therefore congeneric. Failure to suppress this genus will ultimately necessitate the renaming of all the species in the largest genus of North American cicadas, a taxonomic upset as least as great as renaming *Tibicen*. So, by the simple action of suppressing one name that is little used in the world literature, it is possible to retain stability in North American cicada names and at the same time remove the final vestige of the TIBICENINI/TIBICININI confusion.

Comments on *Anaphes* Haliday, 1833 (Insecta, Hymenoptera): proposed designation of *A. fuscipennis* Haliday, 1833 as the type species

(Case 3554; see BZN 68: 122–126; 69: 140; 71: 132–133)

(1) John Noyes

Department of Life Sciences, Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London SW7 5BD, U.K. (e-mail: jsn@nhm.ac.uk)

Huber et al. (BZN 68: 122–126) eloquently put the case for the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary power to set aside Opinion 71, insofar as it applies to the type species of the nominal genus *Anaphes* Haliday, 1833. They argued that the current type species of the genus, *Ichneumon punctum* Shaw, has been shown to belong to the genus *Camptoptera* Förster, 1856 and that the next available genus name for species currently placed in combination with *Anaphes* is *Patasson* Walker, 1846. This would require a change of combination for almost 200 species, many of which are important biological control agents. However, he failed to point out that as *Ichneumon punctum* Shaw belongs to the genus *Camptoptera*, the genus group name *Anaphes* would become the valid genus group name for combination with the 76 species currently placed in *Camptoptera* requiring a further 76 combination changes. This undoubtedly would cause even more confusion. In summary, without the use of the plenary power requested by Huber et al., all 200 species currently placed in *Anaphes* would require generic recombination with *Patasson* and 76 species currently placed in *Camptoptera* would require generic recombination with *Anaphes*. The change would also require seven new generic group name synonymies with *Patasson* and 10 new generic group name synonymies with *Anaphes*. Thus in the interests of simplicity, stability and causing the minimum disruption I support this application.

(2) Mohammad Hayat, Shahid Bin Zeya & Shoeba Binte Anis

Department of Zoology, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh 202 002, India (e-mail: hayat.mohd44@gmail.com)

We agree with Huber et al. (BZN 68: 122–126) and the comments by Huber (BZN 71: 132–133). We are in support of their petition asking the ICZN to set aside the earlier designation of *Anaphes punctum* (Shaw) and to designate *Anaphes fuscipennis* Haliday (1833, p. 346) as the type species of *Anaphes* Haliday, 1833.

The designation of *A. fuscipennis* is the right course in the interests of stability and is consistent with the usage of the generic name *Anaphes*. As noted by Huber et al., the use of *Anaphes punctum* (Shaw) as the type species would lead to instability.

Additional reference

Haliday, A.H. 1833. Essay on the classification of the parasitic Hymenoptera of Britain, which correspond with the Ichneumonones minuti of Linnaeus. *Entomologist Magazine*, 1: 259–276, 333–350.

Corrigendum to Comment on Case 3554

***Anaphes* Haliday, 1833 (Insecta, Hymenoptera): proposed designation of *A. fuscipennis* Haliday, 1833 as the type species**
(see BZN 71: 132–133)

The text in BZN 71: 132, beginning on line 4 from bottom of page, should correctly read ‘the disadvantage of not changing the type species from *I. punctum* Shaw to *A. fuscipennis* Haliday is: . . .’

The added ‘not’ is essential to contrast this statement with the first line in the preceding paragraph of the Comment. The situation could more have been more clearly and explicitly expressed as ‘There are no disadvantages whatsoever in changing the type species of *Anaphes* from *I. punctum* to *A. fuscipennis*’.

Comments on *Spracklandus* Hoser, 2009 (Reptilia, Serpentes, ELAPIDAE): request for confirmation of the availability of the generic name and for the nomenclatural validation of the journal in which it was published

(Case 3601; see BZN 70: 234–237, 71: 30–38; 133–135)

Thomas Cotton

2 Carl Court, Ringwood, 3134, Australia (e-mail: tthomas46@live.com)

I write in support of the application for the following reasons:

1. As a herpetologist, I find the application is perfectly reasonable. Hoser’s Case 3601 was only made necessary by the unscientific and then unethical actions of Wallach et al. (2009) and more recently those of Kaiser (2012a, 2012b, 2013, 2014), Wüster et al. (2014), and the constant attacks on Hoser in social media.

2. Taking relevant publications at face value, in particular those of Hoser (2009) and the response from Wallach, Wüster & Broadley (2009), it is clear that Hoser’s scientific works are not out of the ordinary in any way and should not in the normal course of events warrant ICZN intervention. However, the continued attempts to suppress Hoser’s publications by Kaiser (2014), Schleip (2014) and Wüster et al. (2014), confirm the need for the ICZN to address these matters.

3. Claims by Wallach et al. and others published since in BZN fail to establish by any reasonable interpretation of the Code that Hoser’s original 2009 paper and the

description within was not Code compliant and that his proposed name *Spracklandus* was not available. It is not clear why Wallach et al. (2009) failed to locate available copies of AJH issue 7, which the ICZN Secretariat was able to do some years after the fact.

4. The actions of Wallach et al. and Wüster et al. appear to be an attack on Hoser, on the grounds that he is not presently a tenured academic and therefore has been labelled an 'amateur' (Wüster et al., 2001). This same argument, if used against others, could lead to widespread abuse of the Code to create dual taxonomies across zoology and widespread destabilization of nomenclature.

5. Hoser's proposal must succeed. If Wüster et al. are allowed to overrule the Code to rename taxa properly named by others, this would open the floodgates to similar such attempts, thereby creating instability of nomenclature far beyond the narrow confines of herpetology.

6. Any act by the ICZN which in any way endorses or rubberstamps the actions of Wallach et al. would be viewed with scepticism by the wider scientific community and would only bring into disrepute a body that must for its own survival be considered impartial.

Additional comments:

Comments supporting Case 3601 have also been received from Michael Smyth (*private address, Melbourne, Australia*), and Paul Woolf (*President of the Herpetological Society of Queensland Incorporated*). Those comments are noted and acknowledged, but are not published here because they repeat essentially the same arguments as those presented by Thomas Cotton (above).

Comment on proposed conservation of usage of CORCORACIDAE Mathews, 1927 (Aves) and the spelling *melanorhamphos* Vieillot, 1817 for the valid specific name of the type species of its type genus

(Case 3630; see BZN 70: 238–244)

Paul Sullivan

CEO BirdLife Australia, c/- National Office, Suite 2–05, 60 Leicester St., Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia (e-mail: paul.sullivan@birdlife.org.au)

As Australia's national ornithological organisation representing thousands of professional and amateur ornithologists, BirdLife Australia expresses its support for Case 3630. The application proposes to conserve the established family name for this endemic family of Australian birds, and the familiar spelling *melanorhamphos* of the name of one of its best known species.

Australia has known mudnesters as CORCORACIDAE, and the spelling of the species name of our White-winged Chough as *melanorhamphos*, for as long as we can remember. Both family and species are familiar birds in the most populous parts of the country and are held in high public esteem and affection for their social behaviour. Australian ecologists, behaviourists, physiologists, wildlife managers, writers and photographers rely on lists, field guides and handbooks which use family name CORCORACIDAE and spelling *melanorhamphos* for the chough. BirdLife Australia

believes any change for other than taxonomic reasons is unnecessarily disruptive, for example impacting on internet and searches in research.

Provisions in the Code prevent disruption to names and can be used to preserve the spelling *melanorhamphos*. Article 33.3.1 directs that incorrect subsequent spellings in prevailing use are to be preserved and deemed as correct original spellings, so we are concerned that this has not been applied recently. BirdLife Australia appreciates that scientific nomenclature managed by the Commission serves the global zoological community, and that it applies to all birds. In the interests of nomenclatural stability in Australia, we hope that the Commission will conserve both the name CORCORACIDAE and the spelling *melanorhamphos*. We would also appreciate the opportunity for formal consultation in future reviews of Australian endemic birds.